



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

A

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/721,806	11/24/2000	Richard Hans Harvey	063170.6600	3613
5073	7590	11/01/2005	EXAMINER	
BAKER BOTTS L.L.P. 2001 ROSS AVENUE SUITE 600 DALLAS, TX 75201-2980			PANNALA, SATHYANARAYA R	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2164	

DATE MAILED: 11/01/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. Applicant's Amendment filed on 8/17/2005 has been entered with amended claims 1, 9-10, 14, and 22-23 and added claims 27-31.

### ***Election/Restrictions***

2. Applicant's election of claims 1-5, 9-10, 14-18, and 22-23 in the reply filed on 8/17/2005 is acknowledged. A complete reply to the final rejection must include cancellation of nonelected claims or other appropriate action (37 CFR 1.144). See MPEP § 821.01.

### ***Drawings***

3. The Drawings filed on 8/17/2005 are acknowledged and they are for Fig. 1. Examiner approved them.

### ***Claim Objections***

4. Claim 29 objected to because of the following informalities: Claim limitation stated as "identifying one or more duplicate results". It is not clear from the limitation, since the duplicate rows are possible based on the query. But, if duplicate results are

obtained from more than one sub-query, the optimizer is messing the nested query. Examiner needed more clarification with reference to the specification. Appropriate correction is required.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

"A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.

Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made."

6. Claims 1-5, 9-10, 14-18, 22-23 and 27-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Corn et al. (US Patent 6,356,892) Corn, in view of Lohman et al. (US Patent 6,112,198) Lohman, and in view of Krishna et al. (US Patent 5,412,804).

7. As per independent claim 1, Corn teaches a method for searching a relational database using hierarchical, filter-based queries such as LDAP (col. 2, lines 31-33). Claim 1 is interpreted on the basis of the Fig. 2. Corn teaches the claimed "evaluating each term as a separate SQL instruction" as for each filter element, the method continues to generate SQL subquery according to a set of translation rules (Fig. 5, col. 5, lines 40-44). Corn teaches client machine sending a request (Fig. 1, col. 4,

lines 5-7), which is analogous to receiving a service query. However, Lohman teaches the claimed "receiving a service query" as a given query (col. 2, lines 47). Finally, Lohman teaches the claimed "executing each separate SQL instruction" as the given query is broken up into subtasks and all the subtasks are executed in parallel by the processors (col. 2, lines 47-48).

Corn teaches splitting the received query and does not explicitly teach executing subqueries separately (Fig. 5, col. 5, lines 40-42) whereas Lohman teaches as a given query is broken up into subqueries and executing separately in parallel using several processors (col. 2, lines 47-48). Thus, it would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art of data processing at the time of the invention, to combine teaching of the cited references because Lohman's teachings would have allowed Corn's method for optimization by executing subqueries on data partitions (col. 1, lines 26-27).

Corn and Lohman do not explicitly teach expanding nested terms into un-nested terms. However, Krishna teaches "obtaining a sum of terms by expanding at least one nested term into one or more un-nested terms" as the alternate method of un-nesting a nested query having a count aggregate (Fig. 12, col. 14, lines 60-61). Thus, it would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art of data processing at the time of the invention, to combine teaching of the cited references because Krishna's teachings would have allowed Corn's method to find a better order of execution by the optimizer for evaluating the un-nested query blocks (col. 2, lines 49-51).

8. As per dependent claim 2, Corn teaches the claimed “expanding each term to remove NOT operators” as if a pair of LDAP filter elements are subject to an LDAP logical operator, the corresponding EID sets are merged using an SQL NOT IN logical operator (Fig. 5, col. 7, lines 50-52).

9. As per dependent claim 3, Corn teaches the claimed “a sum of terms are expanded using Boolean logic” as complex search filters are generated by combining basic filters with Boolean operators (col. 7, lines 3-4).

10. As per dependent claim 4, Corn teaches the claimed “the service query is an X.500 or LDAP service query” as the invention provides hierarchical LDAP searching in an LDAP directory service having a relational database management as a backing store (Fig. 5, col. 5, lines 33-37).

11. As per independent claim 9, Corn teaches a method for searching a relational database using hierarchical, filter-based queries such as LDAP (col. 2, lines 31-33). Corn teaches the claimed “a database using a plurality of tables, each table having a plurality of rows and columns, and storing arbitrary data” as the invention provides hierarchical LDAP searches using relational tables in the LDAP directory service having a relational database management system as backing store (col. 2, lines 60-63). Corn teaches the claimed “processing a service query by obtaining a sum of terms by expanding at least one nested term into one or more un-nested terms” as the method begins at step 60 by parsing an LDAP filter-based query for elements and logical

Art Unit: 2164

operators for the filter query (Fig. 5, col. 5, lines 37-40). Further, Corn teaches the claimed "evaluating each term as a separate SQL instruction" as for each filter element, the method continues to generate SQL subquery according to a set of translation rules (Fig. 5, col. 5, lines 40-44).

Corn does not explicitly teach executing subqueries separately. However, Lohman teaches the claimed "executing each separate SQL instruction" as the given query is broken up into subtasks and all the subtasks are executed in parallel by the processors (col. 2, lines 47-48). Corn teaches splitting the received query and does not explicitly teach executing subqueries separately, whereas Lohman teaches as a given query is broken up into subqueries and executing separately in parallel using several processors. Thus, it would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art of data processing at the time of the invention, to combine teaching of the cited references because Lohman's teachings would have allowed Corn's method for optimization by executing subqueries on data partitions (col. 1, lines 26-27).

Corn and Lohman do not explicitly teach expanding nested terms into un-nested terms. However, Krishna teaches "obtaining a sum of terms by expanding at least one nested term into one or more un-nested terms" as the alternate method of un-nesting a nested query having a count aggregate (Fig. 12, col. 14, lines 60-61). Thus, it would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art of data processing at the time of the invention, to combine teaching of the cited references because Krishna's teachings would have allowed Corn's method to find a better order of execution by the optimizer for evaluating the un-nested query blocks (col. 2, lines 49-51).

12. As per dependent claim 10, Corn teaches the claimed “the directory service arrangement including means to perform X.500 or LDAP services” as the invention provides hierarchical LDAP searching in an LDAP directory service having a relational database management as a backing store (Fig. 5, col. 5, lines 33-37).

13. As per independent claim 14, Corn teaches a method for searching a relational database using hierarchical, filter-based queries such as LDAP (col. 2, lines 31-33). Claim 1 is interpreted on the basis of the Fig. 2. Corn teaches the claimed “applying principles of logic to the directory service query to obtain a sum of terms” as the method begins at step 60 by parsing an LDAP filter-based query for elements and logical operators for the filter query (Fig. 5, col. 5, lines 37-40). Further, Corn teaches the claimed “mapping the sum of terms to SQL” as to provide a method for mapping LDAP search queries into an SQL query (col. 2, lines 51-54). Further, Corn teaches the claimed “evaluating each mapped term as a separate SQL instruction” as for each filter element, the method continues to generate SQL subquery according to a set of translation rules (Fig. 5, col. 5, lines 40-44). Corn teaches client machine sending a request (Fig. 1, col. 4, lines 5-7), which is analogous to receiving a service query. However, Lohman teaches the claimed “receiving a directory service query” as a given query (col. 2, lines 47). Corn explicitly does not explicitly teach executing subqueries separately. However, Lohman teaches the claimed “executing each separate SQL instruction” as the given query is broken up into subtasks and all the subtasks are



executed in parallel by the processors (col. 2, lines 47-48). Corn teaches slitting the received query and does not explicitly teach executing subqueries separately, whereas Lohman teaches as a given query is broken up into subqueries and executing separately in parallel using several processors. Thus, it would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art of data processing at the time of the invention, to combine teaching of the cited references because Lohman's teachings would have allowed Corn's method for optimization by executing subqueries on data partitions (col. 1, lines 26-27).

Corn and Lohman do not explicitly teach expanding nested terms into un-nested terms. However, Krishna teaches "obtaining a sum of terms by expanding at least one nested term into one or more un-nested terms" as the alternate method of un-nesting a nested query having a count aggregate (Fig. 12, col. 14, lines 60-61). Thus, it would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art of data processing at the time of the invention, to combine teaching of the cited references because Krishna's teachings would have allowed Corn's method to find a better order of execution by the optimizer for evaluating the un-nested query blocks (col. 2, lines 49-51).

14. As per dependent claim 15, Corn teaches the claimed "expanding each term to remove NOT operators" as if a pair of LDAP filer elements are subject to an LDAP logical operator, the corresponding EID sets are merged using an SQL NOT IN logical operator (Fig. 5, col. 7, lines 50-52).

15. As per dependent claim 16, Corn teaches the claimed “the sum of terms are expanded using Boolean logic” as complex search filters are generated by combining basic filters with Boolean operators (col. 7, lines 3-4).

16. As per dependent claim 17, Corn teaches the claimed “the service query is an X.500 or LDAP service query” as the invention provides hierarchical LDAP searching in an LDAP directory service having a relational database management as a backing store (Fig. 5, col. 5, lines 33-37).

17. As per dependent claim 18, Corn teaches the claimed “the service query is a search service query” as LDAP provides the capability for directory information to be efficiently queried and it offers a rich set of searching capabilities with which users can put together complex queries to get desired information form a backing store (col. 1, line 65 to col. 2, line 2).

18. As per independent claim 22, Corn teaches a method for searching a relational database using hierarchical, filter-based queries such as LDAP (col. 2, lines 31-33). Corn teaches the claimed “a database using a plurality of tables, each table having a plurality of rows and columns, and storing arbitrary data” as the invention provides hierarchical LDAP searches using relational tables in the LDAP directory service having a relational database management system as backing store (col. 2, lines 60-63). Corn teaches the claimed “processing a service query by obtaining a sum of terms by

expanding at least one nested term into one or more un-nested terms” as the method begins at step 60 by parsing an LDAP filter-based query for elements and logical operators for the filter query (Fig. 5, col. 5, lines 37-40). Further, Corn teaches the claimed “mapping the sum of terms to SQL” as to provide a method for mapping LDAP search queries into an SQL query (col. 2, lines 51-54). Further, Corn teaches the claimed “evaluating each mapped term as a separate SQL instruction” as for each filter element, the method continues to generate SQL subquery according to a set of translation rules (Fig. 5, col. 5, lines 40-44).

Corn explicitly does not explicitly teach executing subqueries separately. However, Lohman teaches the claimed “executing each separate SQL instruction” as the given query is broken up into subtasks and all the subtasks are executed in parallel by the processors (col. 2, lines 47-48). Corn teaches slitting the received query and does not explicitly teach executing subqueries separately, whereas Lohman teaches as a given query is broken up into subqueries and executing separately in parallel using several processors. Thus, it would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art of data processing at the time of the invention, to combine teaching of the cited references because Lohman’s teachings would have allowed Corn’s method for optimization by executing subqueries on data partitions (col. 1, lines 26-27).

Corn and Lohman do not explicitly teach expanding nested terms into un-nested terms. However, Krishna teaches “obtaining a sum of terms by expanding at least one nested term into one or more un-nested terms” as the alternate method of un-nesting a nested query having a count aggregate (Fig. 12, col. 14, lines 60-61). Thus, it would

have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art of data processing at the time of the invention, to combine teaching of the cited references because Krishna's teachings would have allowed Corn's method to find a better order of execution by the optimizer for evaluating the un-nested query blocks (col. 2, lines 49-51).

19. As per dependent claim 23, Corn teaches the claimed "The directory service arrangement comprising means to perform X.500 or LDAP services" as the invention provides hierarchical LDAP searching in an LDAP directory service having a relational database management as a backing store (Fig. 5, col. 5, lines 33-37).

20. As per dependent claims 27-31, Krishna teaches the claimed "obtaining a plurality of results wherein each separate SQL instruction is associated with one or more results and combining the one or more results associated with each separate SQL instruction" as when query blocks are pipelined, the result of a first query block is specified as input to the predicate of a second query block, but that result is presumed to be evaluated only once before evaluation of the second query block (col. 2, lines 39-43). NOT is a standard SQL query operator the NOT and every SQL teaches it (col. 5, lines 58-59).

### ***Response to Arguments***

21. Applicant's arguments filed on 8/17/2005 have been fully considered but they are moot in view of the new ground of rejection. Corn and Lohman references are

combined with the newly found Krishna reference teaches each and every limitation as discussed above.

### ***Conclusion***

22. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sathyanarayan Pannala whose telephone number is (571) 272-4115. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 am - 5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Charles Rones can be reached on (571) 272-4085. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2164

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

*srp*  
Sathyanarayan Pannala  
Examiner  
Art Unit 2164

srp  
October 28, 2005

  
**MOHAMMAD ALI**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**